



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/625,009	07/23/2003	Darren Wesemann	3405.2.1	8432
21552	7590	03/23/2006	EXAMINER	
MADSON & AUSTIN GATEWAY TOWER WEST SUITE 900 15 WEST SOUTH TEMPLE SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84101			KOC, TARIK	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2167	
DATE MAILED: 03/23/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/625,009	<b>Applicant(s)</b> WESEMANN, DARREN	
	<b>Examiner</b> Tarik C. Koc	<b>Art Unit</b> 2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                                    |                                                                             |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)               | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                                |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/17/2003</u>                                                            | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-30 are pending in this Office action.

#### ***Specification***

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the docket number on the same page as the abstract should be deleted. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-9, 11, 12, 14, 16-19, 21, 22, 24, 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brichta et al. (U.S. 5,884,310) (hereinafter Brichta).

Regarding claim 1, Brichta discloses in a common integration module on a common computer system, a method for integrating data stored in different types of data repositories into a common data repository, comprising:

receiving first data from a first integration module (Figure 1, element 22, column 3, lines 7-12) on a first computer system (Figure 1, element 14, column 2, lines 47-48),

Art Unit: 2167

wherein the first data is stored in a first format within a first data repository (Figure 1, element 20, column 2, lines 53-57) on the first computer system (column 2, lines 53-57);

receiving second data from a second integration module (Figure 1, element 22, column 3, lines 7-12) on a second computer system (Figure 1, element 14, column 2, lines 47-48), wherein the second data is stored in a second format within a second data repository on the second computer system, and wherein the first format is different (column 2, lines 53-57) from the second format (column 2, lines 65-67); and

updating the common data repository in response to receiving the first data and the second data (Figure 1, element 22, column 3, lines 7-12; see also column 3 lines 19-21).

Regarding claim 2 updating the common data repository comprises storing the first data and the second data in the common data repository (Figure 1, element 22, column 3, lines 7-12; see also column 3 lines 19-21).

Regarding claim 4, translating the first data and the second data into a common format expected by the common data repository (column 3, lines 10-13).

Regarding claim 6, the first data repository and the second data repository are selected from the group consisting of a database and a file (Figure 1, element 20, column 2, lines 53-57).

Regarding claim 7, the first data is received from the first integration module and the second data is received from the second integration module in parallel (Figure 1, element 22, column 3, lines 7-12; Figure 1 depicts multiple source systems each having database controllers 22 that may function at the same time as other database controllers).

4. Regarding claim 8, Brichta discloses in a first integration module (Figure 1, element 22, column 3, lines 7-12) on a first computer system (Figure 1, element 14, column 2, lines 47-48), a method for integrating data stored in different types of data repositories into a common data repository on a common computer system, comprising:

identifying first data to be integrated into the common data repository, wherein the first data is stored in a first format (column 2, lines 53-57), within a first data repository (Figure 1, element 20, column 2, lines 53-57) on the first computer system (Figure 1, element 14, column 2, lines 53-57); and

transmitting the first data to a common integration module on the common computer system, wherein the common integration module also receives second data transmitted from a second integration module (Figure 1, element 22, column 3, lines 7-12) on a second computer system (Figure 1, element 14, column 2, lines 47-48); wherein the second data is stored in a second format in a second data repository (Figure 1, element 20, column 2, lines 53-57) on the second computer system, wherein the second format is different from the first format (column 2, lines 53-57), and wherein the common integration module (Figure 1, element 34, column 4, lines 48-52) updates

Art Unit: 2167

the common data repository in response to receiving the first data and the second data (column 4, lines 48-52).

Identification of data to be integrated in the common data repository is inherent in Brichta, because data retrieved in any way from a source database must necessarily have been identified for transmission to the common data repository.

Regarding claim 9, translating the first data into a common format expected by the common data repository (column 3, lines 10-13).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 13, and 23 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Brichta et al. (U.S. 5,884,310) as applied to the rejection of claim 1, 11, and 21, in view of Crozier (U.S. 5,392,390).

Regarding claim 3, Brichta discloses the invention substantially as claimed as applied to the rejection of claim 1 above, however, Brichta does not explicitly disclose updating the common data repository comprises resolving a conflict between the first data and the second data as claimed.

In the same field of endeavor (integration of data in disparate formats from different sources), Crozier discloses claimed updating the common data repository comprises resolving a conflict between the first data and the second data.

Crozier teaches conflict resolution between a first data and a second data (see also column 5, lines 1-4; see also column 12; lines 1-5).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated Crozier's teachings of conflict resolution between a first data and a second data with Brichta's teachings of updating a common data repository to obtain a common data repository with conflict resolution for the purpose of reconciling conflicts of two source repositories might transmit to the common data repository (Crozier, Abstract, lines 11-15). Further, Crozier provides an effective method of translating data between disparate computer platforms and a wide variety of applications, while ensuring that the data need only be entered once without redundancy (column 3, lines 27-30).

6. Claims 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, and 30 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Brichta et al. (U.S. 5,884,310) as applied to the rejection of claims 1, 8, 11, 18, 21, and 28, in view of Hunkins et al. (U.S. 6,141,663) (hereinafter Hunkins).

Regarding claim 5, Brichta discloses the invention substantially as claimed as applied to the rejection of claim 1 above. Brichta does not explicitly disclose identifying or transmitting changes from a common data repository to integration modules as claimed.

In the same field of endeavor (data integration between multiple databases with redundant data fields) Hunkins discloses claimed:

identifying first changes that have been made to the first data in the common data repository (Figure 3, element 70, column 5, lines 8-14);

transmitting the first changes to the first integration module (Figure 3, element 11, column 5, lines 8-14);

identifying second changes that have been made to the second data in the common data repository; and

transmitting the second changes to the second integration module (Figure 3, element 12, column 5, lines 8-14).

In column 5, lines 8-14 Hunkins discloses a change order (the equivalent of an identification of a change) in a common data repository, and transmission of the change to databases (elements 11-14). The disclosed method can be used to propagate multiple changes of data to the common data repository to multiple databases.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated Hunkins's teachings of transmission of changes with Brichta's teachings of data integration of disparate data repositories to obtain a data integration system that transmits changes to a common data repository to distributed disparate databases for

Art Unit: 2167

the purpose of an improved method for updating redundant data in disparate databases (Hunkins, column 1, lines 6-8). Brichta suggests in column 1, lines 24-26, a need to readily review, compare, and combine data from multiple source databases. Hunkins further suggests in lines 6-10 of column 4 a need in the field of data management for accurately synchronizing redundant data in multiple, disparate databases with less expenditure of time and effort.

Regarding claim 10, Brichta discloses the invention substantially as claimed as applied to the rejection of claim 8. Brichta discloses transmission of data from an integration module to a common integration module but does not disclose expressly identifying changes that have been made to data since a first point in time or transmitting those changes.

In the same field of endeavor (data integration between multiple databases with redundant data fields) Hunkins discloses:

wherein the first data is transmitted to the common integration module at a first point in time, and further comprising:

identifying changes that have been made to the first data in a data repository since the first point in time (column 5 lines 23-25); and

transmitting the changes (column 5, lines 8-14).

Hunkins discloses transmission of changes from a point in time for the purpose of synchronizing databases.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated Hunkins's teachings of transmission of changes with Brichta's teachings of transmission of data from an integration module to a common integration module to obtain a data integration system that transmits changes to a common data repository to distributed disparate databases for the purpose of an improved method for updating redundant data in disparate databases (Hunkins, column 1, lines 6-8). Brichta suggests in column 1, lines 24-26, a need to readily review, compare, and combine data from multiple source databases. Hunkins further suggests in lines 6-10 of column 4 a need in the field of data management for accurately synchronizing redundant data in multiple, disparate databases with less expenditure of time and effort.

Claims 11-17 are essentially the same as claims 1-7 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a method rather than a system and are rejected for the same reason as applied hereinabove.

Claims 18-20 are essentially the same as claims 8-10 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a method rather than a system and are rejected for the same reason as applied hereinabove.

Claims 21-27 are essentially the same as claims 1-7 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a method rather than a computer readable medium and are rejected for the same reason as applied hereinabove.

Art Unit: 2167

Claims 28-30 are essentially the same as claims 8-10 except that it set forth the claimed invention as a method rather than a computer readable medium and are rejected for the same reason as applied hereinabove.

**Contact Information**


7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tarik C. Koc whose telephone number is 571-272-6725. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on 571-272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tarik C Koc  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2167

3/13/2006

  
SHAHID ALAM  
PRIMARY EXAMINER